



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/500,947 | 01/20/2005 | Alan J. Fawcett | 086310-000000US | 1167 |
| 20350 | 7590 | 11/17/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834 | | | FERGUSON, MARISSA L | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2854 | |

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

sf

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/500,947 | Applicant(s) FAWCETT ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Marissa L. Ferguson-Samreth | Art Unit 2854 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 10-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 September 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5 and 13 are rejected under are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchison et al. (US Patent 6,584,893) in view of Hixon et al. (US Publication 2005/0126407).

Regarding claims 1 and 13, Hutchison et al. teaches a steel backing sheet (22) secured to a machine, a metal impression layer (24) secured to the steel backing sheet (22) and engages a substrate to impart an image thereto upon applying pressure to the die plate (20) and a substrate by the machine (Column 9, lines 34-47) and the steel backing sheet layer is secured to the impression layer by magnetic means. However, Hutchison et al. does not teach a compressible adhesive in contact with an impression print plate.

Hixon et al. teaches an embossing system wherein a cushion member (38) is secured to steel die support (32, 62') by adhesive means (Page 5, Paragraph 0064). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention taught by Hutchison et al. to replace the magnetic securing means with an compressible adhesive securing means as taught by

Hixon et al., since Hixon et al. teaches that it is advantageous to provide a more sturdy and stable means to secure impression die plates.

Regarding claim 5, Hutchison et al. teaches wherein an impression die plate layer is formed of copper (Column 9, Lines 58-61).

2. Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchison et al. (US Patent 6,584,893) in view of Hixon et al. (US Publication 2005/0126407) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company (GB 1, 533, 431).

Hutchinson et al. and Hixon et al. both teach the claimed invention with the exception of a compressible adhesive that is a phenolic-based resin and acrylic polymer. Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company teaches a letter press with a compressible mounting material adhesive layer that consists of an acrylic polymer (referring to polyacrylonitrile on Page 3, Line 33) and a phenolic based resin (Page 3, Lines 50-59) for securing a steel back.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention taught by Hutchinson et al. in view of Hixon et al. to replace the adhesive thereof with an adhesive layer made of acrylic polymer and/or phenolic based resin as taught by Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company, since Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company teaches that it is advantageous to adequately secure the layer thereby maintaining compressibility qualities.

3. Claim 3 is rejected under are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchison et al. (US Patent 6,584,893) in view of Hixon et al. (US Publication 2005/0126407) as applied to claim 1, further in view of Procknow et al. (EP 0,235,677).

Hutchison et al. and Hixon et al. both teach the claimed invention with the exception of an adhesive that is an epoxy resin. Procknow et al. teaches an interface epoxy material (Column 4, Lines 34-37) provided between a top steel back surface and base layer. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to further modify the invention taught by Hutchison et al. in view of Hixon et al. to replace the adhesive thereof with an epoxy resin adhesive as taught by Procknow et al., since Procknow et al. teaches that is advantageous to provide a strong bonding material for forming a more reliable plate surface.

4. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchison et al. (US Patent 6,584,893) in view of Hixon et al. (US Publication 2005/0126407) as applied to claim 1, further in view of Marbach (US Patent 4,256,026).

Hutchison et al. and Hixon et al. both teach the claimed invention with the exception of a die plate thickness of about 0.25mm to about 1 mm. Marbach teaches a stamping device with a die plate (2) with a thickness less than 1mm (Claims 2 and 7 on pages 4 and 5). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to further modify the invention taught by Hutchison et al. in view of Hixon et al. to replace the die plate thereof with a die plate with a

thickness of 1mm and less as taught by Marbach, since Marbach teaches that is advantageous to provide a smaller thickness in order to maintain close contact thereby providing a clean sharper image.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 6-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Regarding claim 6, the prior art does not teach or render obvious wherein a die plate has iron embedded in the adhesive.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marissa L. Ferguson-Samreth whose telephone number is (571) 272-2163. The examiner can normally be reached on (M-T) 6:30am-4:00pm and every other (F) 7:30am-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Marissa L Ferguson-Samreth
Examiner
Art Unit 2854

MFS



Daniel J. Colilla
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2854